

Applicant in response to the **05/03/2004** Office Action. The below Remarks and Amendments are responsive to the 05/03/2004 Office Action.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 of the above-identified Patent Application was made on Nov. 1, 2004, as were all fees paid. Additionally an Information Disclosure Statement was filed on Nov. 1, 2004. Please disregard the claim Amendments and Remarks of Nov. 1, 2004, but honor the RCE. Also, please review the Information Disclosure Statement of Nov. 1, 2004. Thank you.

SPECIAL NOTE: The current (new) Examiner is requested to review this file in its entirety. Applicant believes the record will show that this file with claims 1-47 was originally properly examined, the claims were allowed and the issue fee paid. Thereafter an entity (the entity unknown to Applicant despite repeated requests from Applicant as to who the entity was) went into publishing and retrieved this file and recommended to the Group Art Director that this file should be reexamined. After the issue fee was paid, Applicant believes the record will show many serious errors were committed by Officers of the Patent Office disregarding a 95 year standing precedent of the United States Supreme Court to use "Great care" in the rejection of already allowed claims (Ex Parte Hay, 1909) (see MPEP 706.04). "Great care" means that the Patent Office should do its best possible work, yet in this case quite the opposite has been true. After claim allowance and issue fee payment the errors made by the PTO have been amateurish, abundant and repeated. The below text sets out a few of these inexplicable errors, while showing the proper previous allowability of the claims over the very same relied upon Prior Art.

SECOND SPECIAL NOTE: New at this time to this file is new evidence of allowability. The prior art relied upon in error as "newly discovered" was given to Applicant by a third party infringer of issued claims to which the current claims are similar and at least in part terminally disclaimed. The pending

claims and issued claims have now been licensed by the third party for Millions of Dollars, thus clearly achieving Commercial and Licensing Success.

2)

A) Please consider the herein remarks, amendments and the Information Disclosure Statement filed Nov. 1, 2004 followed by finding claims 1-47 once again properly allowable, and new claims 48-56 also allowable. Large Entity fee payments were made Nov. 1, 2004 for the RCE fee and the fee for additional new claims. The Large Entity fee status is believed now proper due to Applicant having licensed his Invention of this Application to a Large Entity, namely Sony, the above mentioned "third party".

B) This response to the 05/03/2004 Office Action is being filed under protest, as the pending claims 1-47 were properly allowed by U.S. Patent Examiner John Paradiso along with his Supervisor Examiner Rinaldi Rada.

C) In the file of this Application No. 09/896,680, please see "Notice of Allowability" PTO date mailed 04/23/2002.

D) Please note that on 05/13/2002 the Patent Issue Fee was paid by Applicant in response to the "Notice of Allowability" of 04/23/2002.

3)

A) Please note that then newly assigned Examiner A. Enatsky in an Office Action "OA" mailed 07/31/2003 on Page 2 thereof advises Applicant that the "Notice of Allowance" is vacated with the reason given on "Page 2" in the second paragraph of the 07/31/2003 OA wherein Examiner Enatsky states that:

***"Newly discovered references make the current claims unpatentable"***

B) Please note that the only two references relied upon by Rejecting Examiner Enatsky in the 07/31/2003 OA are:

- 1) Japanese Unexamined Utility Model Application Publication  
No. 5-87760 to Furukawa, see Page 2, and
- 2) Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication  
No. 7-302159 to Terajima et al, see page 4 of the 7/31/03 OA.

C) 5-87760 Furukawa and 7-302159 Terajima et al are still the only references relied upon in the 05/03/2004 OA, and these two references were supplied to Applicant by Sony who as mentioned above has now purchased a license to the current invention for a substantial amount of money.

4)

A) Please note that included with the 04/23/2002 OA from Examiner Paradiso were 10 pages of Information Disclosure Statement "IDS" sheets filed by Applicant which were initialed, signed and returned to Applicant in the 04/23/2002 Office Action by Examiner Paradiso.

In the 04/23/2002 Office Action the two Japanese references 5-87760 Furukawa and 7-302159 Terajima et al were both noted as being reviewed by Examiner Paradiso on page 1 of the 10 pages of Information Disclosure Statement "IDS" sheets filed by Applicant. Japanese references 5-87760 and 7-302159 had also been previously reviewed by Examiner Paradiso during the earlier examination of Applicant's related U.S. Patent 6,343,991, see "Foreign Patent Documents" in U.S. Patent 6,343,991. Examiner Paradiso was quite familiar with both Japanese references 5-87760 and 7-302159 when he allowed claims 1-47 in the "Notice of Allowability" PTO date mailed 04/23/2002 and when he wrote the "Reasons for Allowance" in the 04/23/2002 Office Action.

B) These two Japanese references reviewed by Examiner Paradiso are the only two references listed by Rejecting Examiner Enatsky on 07/31/2003 and are the so-called "*Newly discovered references*" relied upon by Rejecting Examiner Enatsky. Full printed copies of the two Japanese references of 5-87760 and 7-302159 were provided by Applicant to Examiner Paradiso, and were in this file wrapper of this Application, so they could not be "*Newly discovered references*" as stated by Rejecting Examiner Enatsky.

C) Therefore, the two references solely relied upon by Rejecting Examiner Enatsky as being "*Newly discovered references*" in the 07/31/2003 Office Action, and thus the sole basis for the reexamination after allowance of the claims has absolutely no factual basis, is shown in the instant file to be entirely false and represents a very serious error on the part of the PTO to the great harm of Applicant.

D) Rejecting Examiner Enatsky has admitted in a 01/07/2004 Telephone interview and also in the 05/03/2004 OA that the two Japanese Documents are now understood to not be newly discovered. In the Telephone interview of 01/07/2004 Examiner Enatsky stated he would simply proceed as if this were a normal case, again showing his complete lack of understand of the Rules pertaining to the treatment of previously allowed claims, allowed by an earlier examiner.

5)

A) In Applicant's 01/30/2004 response to the 07/31/2003 Office Action, MPEP 706.04 was clearly set out by Applicant as the rules provided by the Commissioner for Patents to govern rejection of previously allowed claims. The Commissioner requires the following of MPEP 706.04 by Patent Examiners in situations of previously allowed claims such as the current claims 1-47. The strict following of rules set forth by the Commissioner for Patents is the **only** way

in which all Applicants are assured of equal and thus fair treatment under the law.

B) Applicant has below, for the Examiner's convenience, provided a copy of section 706.04 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure copied from the USPTO web site.

MPEP 706.04:

**“706.04 Rejection of Previously Allowed Claims [R-1] - 700  
Examination of Applications**

**706.04 Rejection of Previously Allowed Claims [R-1]**

A claim noted as allowable shall thereafter be rejected only after the proposed rejection has been submitted to the primary examiner for consideration of all the facts and approval of the proposed action.

Great care should be exercised in authorizing such a rejection. See *Ex parte Grier*, 1923 C.D. 27, 309 O.G. 223 (Comm'r Pat. 1923); *Ex parte Hay*, 1909 C.D. 18, 139 O.G. 197 (Comm'r Pat. 1909).

**PREVIOUS ACTION BY DIFFERENT EXAMINER**

Full faith and credit should be given to the search and action of a previous examiner unless there is a clear error in the previous action or knowledge of other prior art. In general, an examiner should not take an entirely new approach or attempt to reorient the point of view of a previous examiner, or make a new search in the mere hope of finding something. >*Amgen, Inc. v. Hoechst Marion Roussel, Inc.*, 126 F. Supp. 2d 69, 139, 57 USPQ2d 1449, 1499-50 (D. Mass. 2001).<

Because it is unusual to reject a previously allowed claim, the examiner should point out in his or her office action that the claim now being rejected was previously allowed by using Form Paragraph 7.50.

**¶ 7.50 Claims Previously Allowed, Now Rejected, New Art**

The indicated allowability of claim [1] is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to [2]. Rejection(s) based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

### Examiner Note

1. In bracket 2, insert the name(s) of the newly discovered reference.
2. Any action including this form paragraph requires the signature of a Primary Examiner. MPEP § 1004.” (end of quote of MPEP 706.04)

6)

A)

Please note MPEP 706.04 the first sentence under the heading “PREVIOUS ACTION BY DIFFERENT EXAMINER” reads:

**“Full faith and credit should be given to the search and action of a previous examiner unless there is a clear error in the previous action or knowledge of other prior art.”**

B) The 07/31/2003 and the current 05/03/2004 Office Actions show a complete and total disregard by the rejecting Examiner for the Commissioner’s mandates in this situation of previously allowed claims. Shown is a total disregard for U.S. law requiring a patent application to be issued as a U.S. Patent when all requirements therefore have been met. The current application has long ago met all of the requirements for issuing as a U.S. Patent, as such was properly determined by Patent Examiner Paradiso and his Supervisor Examiner Rada.

C) Clearly from the mandated rules of MPEP 706.04 the Patent Office can reject previously allowed claims such as claims 1-47 for only two reasons:

- 1) a clear error in the previous action, or
- 2) knowledge of other prior art.

7)

A) From the current file and as detailed herein there is in fact no “knowledge of other prior art”. Therefore that reason, i.e., “knowledge of other

prior art” is not available as a reason to not give “**Full faith and credit**”... “**to the search and action of a previous examiner**”.

“Full faith and credit”... “to the search and action of a previous examiner” in this case cannot be withheld from the action of Examiner Paradiso on the basis of “knowledge of other prior art”, for there is no “knowledge of other prior art” in either the 07/31/2003 or 05/03/2004 Office Actions.

8)

A) Next, the requirement or question which must be addressed under MPEP 706.04 is whether “Full faith and credit”... “to the search and action of a previous examiner” in this case can be withheld from the action of Examiner Paradiso on the basis of “a clear error in the previous action”. The previous action in this case is of course the 04/23/2002 Notice of Allowance for claims 1-47 which Rejecting Examiner Enatsky now claims as his reason for rejection.

B) Please note that “clear error” has a legal definition, meaning: *“A trial judge’s decision or action that appears to a reviewing court to have been unquestionably erroneous.”* (Black’s Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition)

C) In the 05/03/2004 Office Actions, the Rejecting Examiner Enatsky states that the 5-87760 Furukawa document anticipates the claimed invention of Applicant’s claims 1-3, 6-17, 20-24, 30-31, 39, and 42, those claims being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by 5-87760 Furukawa.

D) The 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection on 05/03/2004 is entirely flawed, improper and cannot be sustained because 5-87760 Furukawa as described by the rejecting Examiner on Page 2 of the 05/03/2004 Office Action in the paragraph beginning with “Claims 1-3, 6-17...” completely fails to address an

important claimed feature. That missed claim feature is (paraphrased from Applicant's 01/30/2004 claims as amended) :

a pressure sensitive variable output button located in the right hand area of a two hand held game controller,

see claim 1 lines 14-17 of the claim, see claim 16 lines 9-14 of the claim, see claim 20 lines 13-19 of the claim, see claim 23 lines 11-15 of the claim and also see claim 39 lines 7-8, 13-15 of the claim.

Also please see the instant specification in the "Summary of the Invention" pages 4-6 for the most readily located criticality of right hand pressure sensor buttons on a two hand held game controller.

E) The rejecting Examiner has completely failed to note this very important feature of "a pressure sensitive variable output button located in the right hand area of a two hand held game controller" in the current claims noted above. Applicant here takes the opportunity to state that important feature is in fact not described anywhere in the 5-87760 Furukawa relied upon reference.

F) Furthermore, the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection on 05/03/2004 by the rejecting Examiner is entirely improper and cannot be sustained because 5-87760 Furukawa as described by the rejecting Examiner on Page 2 of the 05/03/2004 Office Action, in the paragraph beginning with "Claims 1-3, 6-17..." also completely fails to address the claim feature of (paraphrased from Applicant's 01/30/2004 claims as amended):

an "individual" pressure sensitive variable output button located on a two hand held game controller, i.e., individual having the meaning of at least not being co-dependent such as with a four-way rocker such as cross key 12 of Furukawa, see current claim 6 lines 7-15 of the claim, see claim 30 lines 3-12 of the claim.

The rejecting Examiner has completely failed to note this important individual or discrete pressure button feature noted as a "discrete" button in the



"reasons for allowance" by Examiner Paradiso and his Supervisor Examiner Rinaldi Rada in the 04/23/2002 Office Action which is in the current claims as noted above and not described in the 5-87760 Furukawa document relied upon for the rejection.

G) Therefore the basis for the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of 05/03/2004 for all of the independent claims 1, 6, 16, 20, 23, 30, and 39 is seriously flawed and must be withdrawn. Please withdraw the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of the 05/03/2004 Office Action as being improper and unsupported because Furukawa does not anticipate the discrete pressure sensor button on a two hand held controller and Furukawa does not anticipate the locating the pressure sensitive button in the right hand area of a two hand held controller. Further because the rejecting Examiner fails to note these important features as he is required to in order to support a proper 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection according to MPEP 2131.

9)

A)

From **MPEP 2131**:

**TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM**

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). >"When a claim covers several structures or compositions, either generically or as alternatives, the claim is deemed anticipated if any of the structures or compositions within the scope of the claim is known in the prior art." *Brown v. 3M*, 265 F.3d 1349, 1351, 60 USPQ2d 1375, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (claim to a system for setting a computer clock to an offset time to address the Year 2000 (Y2K) problem, applicable to records with year date data in "at least one of two-digit, three-digit, or four-digit" representations,

was held anticipated by a system that offsets year dates in only two-digit formats). See also MPEP § 2131.02.< "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Note that, in some circumstances, it is permissible to use multiple references in a 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection. See MPEP § 2131.01 (end of quote from MPEP 2131)

B) It is clear the rejecting Examiner has failed to show the relied upon reference has "each and every element" of the claims, and that the elements are all "arranged as required by the claim" as is mandated under MPEP 2131. The 35 USC 102 rejection is in error and must be withdrawn.

C) The rejecting Examiner has completely failed to meet the requirements of a proper and sustainable 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection for any of the pending claims 1-47, and thus it is requested the rejection be withdrawn.

10)

A) The 35 U.S.C. 103 obviousness rejection by the rejecting Examiner is equally as flawed and in the same manner as his 102(b) rejection, the 103 rejection as written by the rejecting Examiner relying on those very same missing elements described above as missing from the flawed 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection.

B) The rejecting Examiner has completely failed to meet the basic requirements of a proper and sustainable 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection for any of the pending claims as required under MPEP 2143.03 and thus it is requested the

obviousness rejection be withdrawn for failing to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention as required in MPEP 2143.03.

C) From MPEP 2143.03:

**“2143.03 All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested**

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).”

(end of quote from 2143.03)

D) Clearly **all of the limitations are not taught or suggested in the relied upon prior art** as detailed above regarding the flawed 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection, and therefore the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection **must** be withdrawn. Specifically, the individual or discrete pressure button on a two hand held game controller, and separately, the pressure sensitive button in the right hand side of a two hand held game controller features are fully missing in the rejecting Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 4-5, 18-19, 25-29, 32-38, 40-41, and 43-47. The same features missing in the 102 rejection are missing in the 103 rejection.

E) Please withdrawn the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection as being improper for the failure of the rejecting Examiner to show that “all claim limitations” are in the relied upon art as required in 2143.03 wherein the requirement of “All Claim

Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested” is set-out by the Commissioner to be followed by Patent Examiners. Thank you.

11)

A)

Furthermore, regarding the improperness of the obviousness rejection in the 05/03/2004 Office Action: MPEP 706.04 regarding previously allowed claims states: *“an examiner should not take an entirely new approach or attempt to reorient the point of view of a previous examiner”*

The rejecting Examiner when writing the 05/03/2004 Office Action clearly took *“an entirely new approach or attempt to reorient the point of view of a previous examiner”*.

B) Therefore, not only was the rejection basis in the 05/03/2004 OA deeply flawed as above shown in accordance with both MPEP 2131 and MPEP 2143.03, but the manner which the rejecting Examiner went about his reexamination was also deeply flawed in that he clearly took *“an entirely new approach or attempt to reorient the point of view of a previous examiner”*,

Allowing Examiner Paradiso had studied the very same prior art relied upon by the rejecting Examiner, and the rejecting Examiner failed to point to anything new in the relied upon references which showed the references anticipated or suggested the claimed invention of claim 1-47.

C) Withdrawal of the grounds for rejection stated in the 05/03/2004 Office Action is requested and is clearly the proper action to be taken.

12)

A)

Furthermore, MPEP 706.04 regarding rejection of previously allowed claims also states:

**“Great care should be exercised in authorizing such a rejection.”**

See Ex Parte Grier, 1923 C.D. 27, 309 O.G. 223 (Comm'r Pat. 1923); Ex Parte Hay, 1909 C.D. 18, 139 O.G. 197 (Comm'r Pat. 1909). Applicant points out to the current Examiner that this is a long standing precedent set forth by the Courts and honored by the Patent Office for now some 95 years.

B)

“Great care” has a legal definition, meaning: *“1. The degree of care that a prudent person exercises in dealing with very important personal affairs. 2. The degree of care exercised in a given situation by the person most competent to deal with the situation.”* (Black’s Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition)

C)

Great care has in the Office Actions of 07/31/2003 and 05/03/2004 not been exercised in any aspect, in that the rejecting Examiner stated on 07/31/2003 that the two relied upon Japanese references were newly discovered prior art, which very clearly they were not, and then made and continues to make fully unsupported rejections based on the very same prior art previously overcome. Clearly there has been no Great care in any aspect by the rejecting Examiner.

As herein shown, “All” of the mandated requirements of MPEP 706.04 have been disregarded by the rejecting Examiner in some misguided attempt to wrongly reject previously properly allowed claims 1-47.

D) Since MPEP 2131 governing 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections was not at all followed by the rejecting Examiner as above clearly shown, there was no care and certainly no "Great care" in this aspect.

E) Since MPEP 2143.03 governing 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections was not at all followed by the rejecting Examiner as above clearly shown, there was no care and certainly no "Great care" in this aspect.

F) There is no proper basis whatsoever in the rejections of any of claims 1-47 in the 07/31/2004 and 05/03/2004 Office Actions, thus withdrawal of the rejections and allowance, once again, of the claims is requested.

### **Section 13 of Remarks)**

#### **A) Declaration supporting the below statements by Inventor / Applicant:**

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true: and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under 18 U.S.C. 1001 and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

### **New Objective Evidence of Patentability; Secondary Considerations**

B) Below is newly submitted Evidence of Patentability: 1) touching the merits of the invention and claims 1-47, and 2) newly submitted because the evidence was not available sooner due to the Commercial Success and Licensing / Settlement Agreement having not yet occurred. It is respectfully

requested that the newly submitted Evidence of Patentability be considered, and that the claims 1-47 be reexamined and held allowable in view of this response. Even without consideration of the Secondary Considerations, claims 1-47 and new claims 48-56 are allowable as novel and inventive.

C) Regarding the instant Application, Applicant has submitted a terminal disclaimer for U.S. Patent 6,102,802 but not yet for U.S. Patent 6,343,991, as the claims of these two Patents are similar to claims 1-47 of the instant Application. Please read the claims of U.S. Patents 6,102,802 and 6,343,991. Please request a terminal disclaimer for U.S. Patent 6,343,991 if the Examiner believes it required under the law relative to any of the instant claims.

D) Copies of the publications of Furukawa 5-87760 and Terajima et al 7-302159 were given to Applicant by Patent Attorneys defending Sony Computer Entertainment of America (Sony is the Parent company) against infringement charges made by Applicant that the Game machine called Playstation 2 and its two hand-held controller infringes Applicant's US Patent 6,102,802 and U.S. Patent 6,343,991. The Playstation 2 and two hand held controller also is basically described by current claims 1-47.

E) Furukawa 5-87760 and Terajima et al 7-302159 initially were said by the Patent Attorneys (the Law Firm) defending Sony to teach and suggest claims of Patents 6,102,802 and 6,343,991 including but not limited to claims including:

- a two hand-held game controller with
- a pressure-sensitive individual button, or
- a variable pressure sensor positioned in the right-hand area.

F) The Patent Attorneys for Sony who provided Furukawa 5-87760 and Terajima et al 7-302159 were requested by Applicant to specifically identify in

Furukawa 5-87760 and Terajima et al 7-302159 by page, paragraph and line the teachings and or suggestion of the combination of :

- a two hand-held game controller with
- a pressure-sensitive individual button, or
- a variable pressure sensor positioned in the right-hand area.

G) The Patent Attorneys for Sony were apparently unable to specifically adequately identify such teachings or suggestions in the Japanese Publications, much the same as Applicant is unable to locate such teachings or suggestions therein, and lacking any reasonable adequate defense against the infringement charges on claims similar to the current claims 1-47, Sony recently purchased a License to Applicant's technology for many Millions of U.S. Dollars.

H) In addition to the many Millions of Dollars paid to acquire the needed License, Sony also stated in the written record that the Patents of Applicant's including U.S. Patent 6,102,802 and U.S. Patent 6,343,991 were **Valid**. The Attorneys stating Applicant's U.S. Patent 6,102,802 and U.S. Patent 6,343,991 were Valid were very familiar with 5-87760 Furukawa and 7-302159 Terajima et al, after all they were the ones who provided the references to Applicant who in turn provided the references to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

I) The majority of the writing in the License between Applicant and Sony is Strictly Confidential but Applicant could provide photocopies thereof with blacked out confidential data sections if requested by the Examiner.

Please note: Commercial Success and Licensing Activities are Secondary Considerations which when present must be considered by the U.S. Patent Office, Supreme Court Graham v. John Deere Co (1966) and also see MPEP 716.01(a).



J) Sony purchased the License to Applicant's technology for many Millions of U.S. Dollars and stated in writing that the Patents of Applicant's were **Valid**. This payment and License, in Applicant's opinion, would not have been made and entered into by Sony if the two Japanese references taught or suggested the claimed invention, thus such is further substantial evidence of the novelty and inventiveness of the claims.

K) This above Evidence of Patentability is requested to be carefully considered with a reexamination of the current claims 1-47, finding these claims once again Allowable as was earlier properly determined by U.S. Patent Examiner John Paradiso and as was essentially determined by the Patent Attorneys or Law Firm attempting to defend Sony.

The claims were last amended on 01/30/2004 (Jan. 30, 2004) if they were amended. All claims 1-47 are shown below in Amendments, wherein marked up versions are used to show further amendments beyond any of those made 01/30/2004. The amendments are being made to existing claims to make what Applicant is claiming more clear as to what Applicant regards as his invention, not to overcome any prior art or legal deficiency. New claims 48-56 are added, and the Large entity fees were paid on Nov. 1, 2004.